

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13-21, 23-25, 29-33, 35-43, 45, 46, 49-58, and 60-66 are pending, of which Claims 1, 23, 45 and 60 are independent. Claims 12 and 34 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 11, 16, 19, 23, 25, 29, 30, 33, 38, 41, 45, 49, 54, and 60-66 have been amended to further clarify the distinctions between the present invention and the cited art, and to correct minor informalities in the claims. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure. Thus, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 7-13, 19, 20, 23, 29-35, 41, 42, 45, 50-54, 57, and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sandus et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0072993) in view of Su (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0026380) and Nowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033205). Claims 2, 24, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sandus et al. in view of Su and Nowers et al., and further in view of Pugliese et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0044751). Claims 3, 25, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sandus et al. in view of Su and Nowers et al., and further in view of Olefson (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0083957). Claims 14, 15, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sandus et al. in view of Su and Nowers et al., and further in view of DeAngelis (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0075940). Claims 16-18, 38-40, and 55-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over

Sandus et al., in view of Su and Nowers et al., and further in view of Howell et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0195818). Claims 21, 22, 43, 44, 58, and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sandus et al., in view of Su and Nowers et al., and further in view of Czepluch (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0069832). Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for a user to shop online in a three dimensional virtual reality setting. Actual store websites of a first store and a second store of a virtual shopping location are displayed, respectively, upon request. The actual store website of each store is linked to the virtual shopping location, is independently managed by the respective store, and resides on a distinct sever (distinct from a shopping server and a server for the other store website). As a virtual shopping cart feature, a product from the actual store website of the first store and a product from the actual store website of the second store, respectively, are stored in a shopping cart memory of the shopping server. A request to purchase the products is then received. Thus, in the context of a virtual shopping location, products from independently-controlled actual store websites, the actual store websites residing on distinct servers, can be placed together in a universal virtual shopping cart.

Sandus et al., relates to a method and system of an integrated business topography and virtual 3D network portal. The Office Action admits that Sandus et al. does not suggest that the actual store websites are independently managed by the respective stores and reside on distinct servers, that a product from the actual store website is stored in a shopping cart memory of the shopping server, or that a request is received to purchase the products (which are from different

actual store websites of different stores) in the virtual shopping cart. Applicants also have not found any suggestion in Sandus et al. of these elements of Claim 1.

Su relates to a shopping system of integrated electronic commerce and physical commerce. The Office Action cited Su to teach that a website of an electronic commerce server system may be independently managed by a store and reside on the store's own server. However, Su does not appear to suggest storing a product from the actual store website of a first store and a product from the actual store website of a second store in a shopping cart memory of a shopping server.

Nowers et al. relates to a method and system for facilitating fulfillment of electronic commercial transactions. The Office Action cited Nowers et al. to teach that it is known to store products from different vendors in a shopping cart. However, Nowers et al. relates to a retailer offering for sale products received from a plurality of different vendors through an electronic storefront. (See Abstract.) As presently understood by Applicants, a shopping cart of Nowers et al. relates to a single electronic storefront run by a retailer, such that a user selects products to put in the shopping cart only from the single electronic storefront of the retailer, rather than from individual actual store websites of the different branded vendors. In contrast, in the present invention as recited in Claim 1, a product from the actual store website of the first store is stored in the shopping cart memory of the shopping server and a product from the actual store website of the second store is stored in the shopping cart memory of the shopping server.

The other cited art of record was cited for reasons unrelated to the features of currently-amended Claim 1, and does not appear to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Sandus et al., Su, and Nowers et al.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the invention defined by Claim 1 would not have been obvious over the cited art, whether taken singly or in combination, and thus Claim 1 is allowable. Independent Claims 23, 45, and 60 recite features similar to that discussed above relative to Claim 1, and thus Claims 23, 45, and 60 are allowable for similar reasons. The remaining claims in the application are each dependent, either directly or indirectly, on one of Claims 1, 23, 45, and 60, and are thus allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claims. Further, the dependent claims are also allowable for reciting additional patentable features of Applicants' invention. Applicants request favorable and independent consideration thereof.

Applicants submit that this application is condition for allowance and request a prompt Notice of Allowance.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C., office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence A. Stahl/

Attorney for Applicants
Larry A. Stahl
Registration No. 30,110

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
LAS:ayr

FCHS_WS 2665246v1